

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

* * *

Tracker Silah San. Ve TIC, LTD. STI., a
Turkish Limited Liability Company

Case No. 2:22-cv-00046-GMN-DJA

Plaintiff,

Order

V.

Salim Ozgilik, an individual; and Akdal Arms, LLC, a Nevada Limited Liability Company,

Defendants.

This matter is before the Court on the parties' stipulated protective order (ECF No. 16),
led on February 14, 2022. The parties request that the Court enter a protective order to govern
their exchange of confidential information. However, the parties fail to state the governing
standard for filing documents under seal with the Court. This order reminds counsel that there is
presumption of public access to judicial files and records. A party seeking to file a confidential
document under seal must file a motion to seal and must comply with the Ninth Circuit's
directives in *Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172 (9th Cir. 2006) and
Center for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Group, LLC, 809 F.3d 1092, 1097 (9th Cir. 2016).

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the parties' stipulated protective order (ECF No. 16) is granted subject to the following modifications:

- The Court has adopted electronic filing procedures. Attorneys must file documents under seal using the Court's electronic filing procedures. *See Local Rule IA 10-5.* Papers filed with the Court under seal must be accompanied with a concurrently-filed motion for leave to file those documents under seal. *See Local Rule IA 10-5(a).*
- The Court has approved the instant protective order to facilitate discovery exchanges, but there has been no showing, and the Court has not found, that any

1 specific documents are secret or confidential. The parties have not provided
2 specific facts supported by declarations or concrete examples to establish that a
3 protective order is required to protect any specific trade secret or other confidential
4 information pursuant to Rule 26(c) or that disclosure would cause an identifiable
5 and significant harm.

- 6 • All motions to seal shall address the standard articulated in *Ctr. for Auto Safety*
7 and explain why that standard has been met. 809 F.3d at 1097.
- 8 • Specifically, a party seeking to seal judicial records bears the burden of meeting
9 the “compelling reasons” standard, as previously articulated in *Kamakana*. 447
10 F.3d 1172. Under the compelling reasons standard, “a court may seal records only
11 when it finds ‘a compelling reason and articulate[s] the factual basis for its ruling,
12 without relying on hypothesis or conjecture.’” *Ctr. for Auto Safety*, 809 F.3d at
13 1097. (quoting *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1179). “The court must then
14 ‘conscientiously balance[] the competing interests of the public and the party who
15 seeks to keep certain judicial records secret.’” *Ctr. for Auto Safety*, 809 F.3d at
16 1097.
- 17 • There is an exception to the compelling reasons standard where a party may satisfy
18 the less exacting “good cause” standard for sealed materials attached to a
19 discovery motion unrelated to the merits of the case. *Id.* “The good cause
20 language comes from Rule 26(c)(1), which governs the issuance of protective
21 orders in the discovery process: ‘The court may, for good cause, issue an order to
22 protect a party or person from annoyance, embarrassment, oppression, or undue
23 burden or expense.’” *Id.* (citing Fed.R.Civ.P. 26(c)). “For good cause to exist, the
24 party seeking protection bears the burden of showing specific prejudice or harm
25 will result if no protective order is granted.” *Phillips v. General Motors*, 307 F.3d
26 1206, 1210-11 (9th Cir. 2002).
- 27 • The labels of “dispositive” and “nondispositive” will not be the determinative
28 factor for deciding which test to apply because the focal consideration is “whether

1 the motion is more than tangentially related to the merits of a case.” *Ctr. for Auto
2 Safety*, 809 F.3d at 1101.

3 • The fact that the Court has entered the instant stipulated protective order and that a
4 party has designated a document as confidential pursuant to that protective order
5 does not, standing alone, establish sufficient grounds to seal a filed document. *See*
6 *Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1133 (9th Cir. 2003); *see also Beckman Indus., Inc. v. Int'l Ins. Co.*, 966 F.2d 470, 476 (9th Cir. 1992). If
7 the sole ground for a motion to seal is that the opposing party (or non-party) has
8 designated a document as confidential, the designator shall file (within seven days
9 of the filing of the motion to seal) either (1) a declaration establishing sufficient
10 justification for sealing each document at issue or (2) a notice of withdrawal of the
11 designation(s) and consent to unsealing. If neither filing is made, the Court may
12 order the document(s) unsealed without further notice.
13

14 • To the extent any aspect of the stipulated protective order may conflict with this
15 order or Local Rule IA 10-5, that aspect of the stipulated protective order is hereby
16 superseded with this order.

17 IT IS SO ORDERED.

18 DATED: February 15, 2022.

19
20 
21 DANIEL J. ALBREGTS
22 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
23
24
25
26
27
28